

Remarks

In view of the following amendments and remarks, favorable reconsideration of the outstanding office action is respectfully requested. Claims 1-33 have been canceled. New claims 34-73 have been added.

1. Drawings

The Examiner has indicated that new corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121 (d) are required in this application. In accordance with the examiner's comments, new drawings are being prepared by a competent draftsman. In accordance, the new drawings will be provided to the patent office in a subsequent communication.

2. Specification

The Examiner has objected to the disclosure because of various informalities or typographical errors in the specification, which have been corrected above as appropriate.

In particular, the Examiner point out on page 18, line 2 that "comparator 401 doesn't have a negative input terminal labeled 463." The paragraph in question has been amended to address the Examiner's comment. Accordingly in the amended specification, comparator 401 has been amended to comparator 424.

The Examiner points out on page 18, line 7 that "part 404 is described as a 'time delay unit' and a 'filter'". The paragraph in question has been amended to address the Examiner's comment. Accordingly in the amendment of the specification, any reference to a time delay unit has been eliminated.

The Examiner points out on page 18, line 19 that " 'rectifier 406' should apparently read 'rectifier 416.' " The paragraph in question has been amended to address the Examiner's comment. Accordingly in the amended specification, rectifier 406 has been amended to rectifier 416.

The Examiner points out that on page 24, lines 13 and 14, "part 525 is referred to as an "output voltage divider integrated circuit" while on page 25 line 2, parts 525 is referred to as a "ratio detector." The paragraph in question has been amended to address the Examiner's comment. Accordingly, in the amendment of the specification, any reference to a ratio detector 525 has been amended to output voltage divider integrated circuit 525.

3. § 112 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for reasons of clarity. In response, the applicant has canceled claims 1-33 and has submitted claims 34-73 in the instant response to particularly point out and distinctly claim what the applicant regards as his invention.

4. § 102 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 29 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Burns (U.S. Patent No. 4,155,041.) The applicant has submitted new claims 34-73 for the Examiner's consideration.

5. § 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 29 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable for obviousness over Packard (U.S. Patent No. 4,322,641) (hereinafter Packard) in view of Burns (U.S. Patent No. 4,155,041) (hereinafter Burns). In response, the applicant has canceled claims 1-33. Applicant has submitted new claims 34-73 for the Examiner's consideration.

6. § 101 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-11, 13-14, and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for double patenting. In response, the applicant has canceled claims 1-33. Applicant has submitted new claims 34-73 for the Examiner's consideration.

7. Conclusion

Based upon the amendments, remarks, and papers of record, Applicant believes the pending claims of the above-captioned application are in allowable form and patentable over the prior art of record. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims 34-73 and a prompt Notice of Allowance thereon.

Applicant believes that no extension of time is necessary to make this Response timely.

Please direct any questions or comments to Thomas N. Packard at (315) 476-9121.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 4, 2005

Thomas N. Packard
Thomas N. Packard
Applicant
4811 McDonald Road
Syracuse, New York 13215
(315) 476-9121